DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 601 FL 022 235

AUTHOR Christianson, Kiel
TITLE Contrastive Pragmatics of English and Japanese Offers and Requests.
PUB DATE 11 Mar 94
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (28th, Baltimore, MD, March 8-12, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Comparative Analysis; Cross Cultural Studies; *Cultural Awareness; Cultural Differences; Cultural Influences; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Interpersonal Communication; *Interpersonal Competence; Language Research; Language Usage; Native Speakers; *North American Culture; *Pragmatics; *Second Language Learning; Sociocultural Patterns
IDENTIFIERS Japan

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes a study by Fukushima (1990) of the English offers and responses of Japanese English as a foreign language (EFL) college students and reports on an experiment designed to address the perceived weaknesses of Fukushima's work. Fukushima's study found that many Japanese EFL learners could not use appropriate levels of politeness in English. Using the same interactive offer and response situations, the present study examined both Japanese and English offers and requests of Japanese EFL college students, comparing them to the English offers and requests of native English speakers from the same age group (18 to 31 years old). It found that both English and Japanese speakers of the age group surveyed differentiated expressions between close friends and acquaintances, something that Fukushima claimed was not done in English. The native English speakers often used directives or direct questions when offering or making requests. Other findings are discussed and elaborated on. An appendix provides a copy of the offer and request scenarios. (MDM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 371 601

# "CONTRASTIVE PRAGMATICS OF ENGLISH AND JAPANESE OFFERS AND REQUESTS"

Presented by: Kiel Christianson
The University of Aizu
Tsuruga, Aizu-Wakamatsu City
Fukushima-ken, 965-80 Japan
tel.: 81-242-37-2593
email: kiel@u-aizu.ac.jp

The 28th Annual TESOL Conference
March 11, 1994

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kiel Christianson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL022235

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

Pragmatic appropriateness is particularly difficult for ESOL teachers to assess because it is dependant on the specific situation, the specific interactants, varying ideas of what is polite in the L2, and L1 interference (both negative and positive). Without a clear understanding of these factors, teachers are left with their own unanalyzed intuitions and personal biases against which to judge learner production. This paper uses a contrastive approach to illustrate the pragmatics of offers and requests in both English and Japanese. In particular, one previous non-contrastive study on these speech acts will be reviewed as an example of how L2 production can be wrongly judged as inappropriate if the factors mentioned above are not completely understood.

## 1.0 Introduction

The present research[1] was conducted in response to a study by Fukushima (1990) in which English offers and requests were elicited from college-aged Japanese EFL learners. Their responses were consistantly criticized as impolite by Fukushima and 18 native speaker (NS) EFL teachers in Japan; however not all of the "impolite" responses sounded inappropriate to the ears of a small group of native speakers who were asked to read the study before the research for this paper was begun. The first goal of this research, then, was to find out how English NSs in a given age group actually make offers and requests in various situations. Only by doing this can non-native speaker (NNS) expressions be accurately and fairly evaluated.

The second goal was to establish a link between a lack of explicit pragmatic training in the ESOL classroom and L1 strategy transfer. This sort of L1 transfer is well-documented in grammar (cf. Brown, 1987), but not in pragmatics. Fukushima focuses on the importance of L2

pragmatic training, but fails to point out the frequency and significance of the L1 transfer it can lead to.

The third goal was to find out if in fact L1 pragmatic transfer is always negative transfer. In other words, if a contrastive study of Japanese and English offers and requests were to identify some similarities in politeness strategies and overall pragmatic composition between the two languages, might teachers not want to bring this to the attention of Japanese ESOL learners and encourage a conscious analysis of both? Doing so, it will be argued, will serve to make the English speech acts less foreign and more accessible to learners.

## 2.0 A brief overview of the original study

The major findings or Fukushima's 1990 study of Japanese EFL learners' English offers and requests are as follows: "1) [T]he Japanese subjects could not use appropriate expressions according to the situations, even when they wanted to be more polite to the addressees; and 2) the expressions used by the Japanese subjects were too direct in most situations, and sounded rude" (p. 317). The immediate question is, To whom did these expressions sound rude? In fact, the subject responses were judged against responses by NS EFL teachers in Japan. There are at least three problems with this.

The first problem is one of age. The learners, first or second year college students, were interacting (in ficticious situations devised by Fukushima and presented in questionnaire form) with people their own age. The teachers were in all likelihood (based on personal experience in Japan) at least 7-

10 years older. The second problem is one of dialect. No mention was made in the study of what dialects were spoken by the NSs. The third problem is one of location. It is often the case in Japan that EFL teachers tend to be relatively isolated from English-speaking communities outside of an academic setting. Thus they tend to lose touch with mainstream American English and, as a result, are prone to hypercorrection (this assertion is also based on personal experience as a teacher in Japan).

Regarding the sources of the learners' (perceived) impolite offers and requests, Fukushima quotes various beliefs about English which are commonly held by Japanese learners such as: "[I]n English, [people] say things more directly than do the Japanese" (p. 323), and "[I]t [sounds] distant [to use] formal expressions to...close friends" (p. 325). Fukushima asserts that this notion of informality as an expression of closeness or solidarity is typically Japanese but not a characteristic of English, and continues to claim that such blunt offers and requests sound rude in English even to close friends.

Moreover, Fukushima asserts that "...Japanese subjects differentiated expressions [in English] when offering something to close friends and when offering something to acquaintences. The native English-speaking subjects did not make this distinction" (p. 317). As for the native English speakers, they "used more in direct expressions with decreasing degrees of closeness" (p. 318). In the present study, the findings in these respects differed significantly.

The inappropriate learners' offers and requests were attributed largely by Fukushima to a lack of English pragmatic training. This lack apparently resulted in pragmatic transfer from Japanese, although this is never mentioned. Since the study was not contrastive, no Japanese offers or requests were elicited and thus could not be compared to the L2 speech acts. The present study has sought to elicit, analyze and compare both English and Japanese offers and requests. In doing so, it is hoped that a clearer understanding of the pragmatics of both languages will help Japanese EFL learners to recognize and employ appropriate politeness strategies in English offers and requests.

## 3.0 Method

In an attempt to elicit data that would be comparable to the data in the original study, the same situational questionnaire was used here as in Fukushima's study. The only difference was that in the present study, Japanese learners (n=10, 3 males, 7 females all between the ages of 18 and 31) were asked to respond in Japanese, while native English speakers (n=10, 3 males, 7 females all between the ages of 18 and 31) responded in English. And finally, a group of native Japanese speakers studying EFL in their first year of college responded in English (n=22). These responses were not part of the contrastive study, but were used instead to highlight areas of pragmatic weaknesses typical of Japanese EFL learners.

The questionnaire devised by Fukushima and used in both studies (see the Appendix) attempts to eliminate the variables

of social status and age, both of which heavily influence Japanese pragmatics. The one variable tested was the "degree of closeness" between the addresser and the addressee. The three degrees of closeness are: a) the addresser is very close to the addressee; b) the addresser gets along with the addressee; c) the addresser does not get along with the addressee.[2]

All responses (English and Japanese) were analyzed according to the method devised by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984). This method was also used in the Fukushima study, but has been adapted slightly here. The terms and abbreviations used in this method are given in Table 1.

***TABLE 1***

**THE ANALYSIS METHOD USED TO DESCRIBE PRAGMATIC FUNCTION**
(Modified from Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984)

sequences (abbreviations)

1. address term(s) (AT)
2. head act (HA)
3. adjunct to head act (ADJ)
4. adjunct expressing gratitude (ADJ-grat)
5. adjunct promising return (ADJ-ret)
6. lead-in (LI)

4.1 Analysis of English offers

Table 2 gives representavive offers elicited from native English speakers (multiple responses are marked (*n*x)). Asterisks mark those offers which would have been judged as inappropriate in Fukushima's study had they been given by Japanese EFL learners. These offers include directives

(Searle, 1976) to close friends such as, "Sit down" and direct inquiries of addressees with whom the addresser does not get along such as "Do you want some beer?" Note that these responses were given by Fukushima's EFL learners and judged as "rude" or "pushy" (p. 319-20), but occur frequently on the present surveys of native speakers of the same age group, suggesting that Fukushima's subjects were judged too harshly.

***TABLE 2***

**Offers elicited from native English speakers (n=10, ages 18-31)**

Situation #1: Offering a seat
(Very close to addressee)

-- (HA)Here, sit down.*
-- (HA)Sit down!* (2x)
-- (HA)Have a seat. (2x)
-- (HA)You can have my seat. (2x)

(Gets along with addressee)

-- (HA)Would you like to sit down?
-- (HA)Let me see if I can find you a seat. (2x)
-- (HA)Have a seat! (2x)
-- (HA)You can sit down.*
-- (HA)You can have a seat (ADJ)if you'd like.

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (HA)Do you want to sit down?*
-- (HA)Have a seat.
-- (ADJ)There's a seat (HA)if you wanna sit down.
-- (Wouldn't offer.) (4x)

Situation #2: Offering a beer
(Very close to addressee)

-- (HA)Wanna/Want a beer? (4x)
-- (HA)How about a beer?

(Gets along with the addressee)

-- (HA)Would you like a beer? (4x)
-- (HA)Get yourself a beer.
-- (HA)Help yourself.

(Does not get along with the addressee)

-- (HA)Would you like a beer? (3x)
-- (HA)Can I get you a beer? (2x)
-- (HA)Do you want a beer?*
-- (Wouldn't offer) (3x)

Situation #3: Offering a cup of coffee
(Very close to addressee)

-- (HA)Coffee? (2x)
-- (HA)(You) Want some coffee? (5x)

(Gets along with the addressee)

-- (HA)Would you like some coffee? (5x)
-- (HA)Can I get you some coffee? (2x)
-- (HA)Want some coffee?

(Does not get along with the addressee)

-- (HA)Do you want a cup of coffee?*
-- (HA)Would you like some coffee?
-- (ADJ)Got some coffee here (HA)if you want some.
-- (ADJ)If you want some coffee, (HA)the pot's over there.
-- (Wouldn't offer) (5x)

The disagreement between Fukushima's study and this one is especially obvious in the case of offering a seat to a close friend. The directive "Sit down" appears to be quite natural in this context and does not seem to offend any of the college-aged NSs. Fukushima does recognize that intonation plays an important part in making offers (p. 320), and allows for the fact that offers may seem rude in writing when in fact they may be acceptable when delivered orally with a rising tone. As this would be the only acceptable way to say "Sit down" to a close friend, it can only be assumed that the NSs in the present survey would have delivered the offer/directive in just this way. Japanese EFL learners need to be made aware of these intonational features through explicit practice in the classroom. They should not however be told that offers of this type are inappropriate in all cases.

Another discrepency between Fukushima's data and these data is that there are several instances of rather blunt offers made when the degree of closeness decreases. This contradicts, in part, Fukushima's finding that "native English-speaking subjects used more indirect expressions with decreasing degrees of closeness" (p. 318). Examples of this are, "Do you want a beer?" and "There's a seat if you wanna sit down."

Most importantly, Fukushima's assertion that native English speakers do not differentiate expressions when offering something to a close friend and to an acquaintance (p. 317) appears unfounded. For the most part, the subjects here were very direct when the degree of closeness was the highest. They were unlikely to use modal verbs like "can" or "would" with close friends, but were quite likely to use them with acquaintances. (See the discussion of requests below for a more detailed discussion of modals as politeness markers.)

4.2 Analysis of English requests

Requests differ greatly from offers in that requesting threatens the "negative face" of the addressee (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Whereas offering tends to improve the addresser's "positive face," or the desire to be approved of by others, requesting imposes on the addressee's negative face, or desire to be unimpeded by others (Holtgraves and Yang, 1990, p. 720). Thus, requesting represents a much more potentially uncomfortable situation for the addresser. As such, we would exprect to find a greater instance of language-specific politeness strategies employed in both Japanese and

English requests than in offers.

Brown and Levinson (1987, as summarized by Holtgraves and Yang, 1990, p. 720) have categorized four superstrategies which are ordered according to the extent to which they threaten the addresser's face, or desired public image. The most threatening strategy is the "bald-on-record" request/demand. The least face-threatening strategy is the off record hint. Between these two extremes are positive politeness strategies (i.e. strategies which seek to build camaraderies or solidarity with the addressee) and negative politeness strategies (i.e. strategies which indicate the addresser's respect for the addressee's freedom of action, deferring to the addressee's freedom of choice). For the present research, Japanese and English requests were analyzed within this paradigm, which is actually a hybrid of Brown and Levinson (1987) and Lakoff (1975, as cited in McGloin, 1983). Table 3 illustrates the continuum of these politeness strategies and gives examples of each.

***TABLE 3***

**POLITENESS STRATEGIES USED IN REQUESTS**
(According to a strategy categorization which is a hybrid of R. Lakoff (1975) as cited in McGloin (1983) and Brown and Levinson (1987).)

Listed in order of most to least threatening to the addresser's face, or desired public image.

*bald-on-record --> positive politeness strategies --> negative politeness strategies --> off record*

Examples:

*Bald-on-record*:

"Give me back my money."

*Positive politeness strategy* (i.e. an attempt to build camaraderie with the addressee):

"How about buying us lunch today?"

*Negative politeness strategy* (i.e. an indication of the addresser's respect for the addressee's freedom of action):

"Could you buy me lunch today?"

*Off record hint*:

"I'm really short of money this week."

The most typical negative politeness strategies used by the English respondents included the modal verbs "can/could" and "would." The first two represent deference to the addressee's ability to comply, while the third defer to the addressee's willingness to comply. "Could" is considered more tentative and therefore less threatening than "can," and for the same reason "would" less threatening than "will" (which was not used in any of the elicited requests)(Alexander, 1988, p. 223). These modals can be made even more polite (less threatening) by including additional "softeners" which work to further emphasize the addresser's recognition of the addressee's freedom of action. Some of these softeners include "possibly," "Do you happen to have...," and "if"-clauses. Besides modals, the past continuous as in "I was wondering..." was also used to show tentativeness, and is considered to be more polite than "I wonder..." (Leech, 1971, p. 28-9).

Further features of the requests elicited here include the use of "please," promising the return of borrowed money or property, and expressions of gratitude before the request has been granted. The use of "please" was spread fairly evenly

across all three degrees of closeness in all three situations, although it was more commonly used in the money-borrowing situation. The occurance of "please" seems to contradict Fukushima's assertion (based on Tsuda, et al, 1988, p. 99) that "please" makes commands or directions more polite, but not requests (Fukushima, 1990, p. 322). Apparently however "please" was felt by the NSs surveyed here to make some English requests more polite as it was used so regularly. Again, intonation is curcial here. When said in a truly plaintive tone, "please" does add to the overall politeness of a request. Another factor determining its use may be the perceived size of the request. Kitao and Kitao (1991) remark that in English, larger requests are made more politely than smaller ones, often regardless of the relative social status, age or closeness of the interactants. Perhaps this is why the "plaintive please" appears so often in the money-related situations. It should be noted though that "please" is not used in English offers, but can be seen throughout Table 11, due to direct translation of Japanese "douzo." Clearly, careful and thoughtful instruction in the appropriate use of "please" is sorely needed in the EFL classroom.

Expressions of gratitude (ADJ-grat) were employed exclusively in the money-borrowing situation and only then when the addresser did not get along with the addressee. Promises of return (ADJ-ret) were used almost exclusively in the money-borrowing situation at all three levels of closeness. In the NNSs English requests (see Table 12), adjuncts of these types were only rarely included. These

types of adjuncts do however appear in the Japanese requests. This is therefore an opportunity for ESOL teachers to exploit the pragmatic similarity of the two languages and do some explicit instruction in forming and using these expressions when requesting in English.

A very commonly employed type of request were strong or obvious hints directed at the addressee such as, "Do you have that $30 you owe me?" Here the addresser never explicitly asks for the the money, but it is clearly understood that repayment is expected, not just a yes or no answer. Questions such as this also occur in offering situations (eg. "Would you like a beer?"). In such cases, the addressee is not responding to the illocutionary force of the addresser's utterance, but rather to the perlocutionary intent of the addresser (Levinson, 1983, p. 290-1). Such requests fall somewhat to the left of the extreme right end, the off record end, of the Lakoff/Brown and Levinson continuum in Table 3.

Finally, several English requests were preceded with adjuncts that offered a reason for the addresser's request, which is also cited as a common feature of Fukushima's English NS requests (1990, p. 321). Also, many of the present English requests were begun with what are referred to here as a "lead-in" (LI), such as "Hey," "Guess what?" or "Oh great." Such adjuncts call attention to the fact that the addresser finds him/herself in an unexpected position of need and signals the beginning of a request.

Table 4 shows representative NS English requests. Again, expressions marked with an asterisk were considered by

Fukushima (1990) to be inappropriate when used by Japanese EFL learners.

***TABLE 4***
**Requests elicited from native English speakers**
**(n=10, ages 18-31)**

Situation #1: Asking for repayment of a loan
(Very close to addressee)

-- (HA)Do you have that $30 you owe me? (3x)
-- (HA)I want my money.*
-- (HA)Could I have the $30 I loaned you, please?*
-- (ADJ)I need my money you owe me. (HA)Do you have it?

(Gets along with addressee)

-- (HA)I was wondering if you had my $30 yet?

-- (HA)I was wondering when I can get the $30 I gave to you back?
-- (HA)Do you (happen to) have that $30 you owe me? (3x)

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (HA)Would you please give me my money back?*
-- (HA)Do you have the $30 I loaned you?
-- (HA)When do you think I could get my money back?
-- (ADJ)I'm going to need that $30 that you owe me. (HA)When would you be able to pay me?

Situation #2: Asking to borrow a CD
(Very close to addressee)

-- (HA)Let me borrow your CD.* (3x)
-- ((LI)Hey,) (HA)can I borrow your CD? (4x)
-- (HA)Could I borrow your CD? (2x)

(Gets along with addressee)

-- (HA)I was wondering if I could borrow your CD? (2x)
-- (HA)Can I use your CD (please*)? (2x)
-- (HA)Would I be able to borrow your CD?

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (HA)Do you think I could borrow your CD? (2x)
-- (HA)Can I borrow your CD?*
-- (HA)Can I borrow your CD? (ADJ-ret)I'll give it back tomorrow.
-- (HA)I was wondering if I might be able to borrow your CD.
-- (Wouldn't ask) (3x)

Situation #3: Asking someone to pay for lunch
(Very close to addressee)

-- (ADJ)I forgot my money. (HA)Can you cover me/mine (ADJ-ret)until we get back? (3x)
-- (ADJ)I forgot my money. (HA)Could you loan me some to pay for my lunch?
-- (HA)Loan me some money (ADJ-ret)until I can get you back.*

(Gets along with addressee)

-- (HA)Is there any way I could borrow some money please?*
-- (HA)Would it be possible for me to borrow some money (ADJ-ret)till I get home?
-- (ADJ)I forgot my money. (HA)Could you loan me some to pay for lunch?
-- (LI)Great, (ADJ)I left my money at home. (HA)Would you mind loaning me a few dollars, (ADJ-ret)and let me pay you back later?
-- (ADJ)I forgot my money. (HA)Could you please lend me some for lunch (ADJ-ret)and I'll pay you back as soon as possible.

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (LI)I really need to ask a favor from you, If you could. (ADJ)I forgot my money. (HA)Could you loan me the money (ADJ-ret)until tomorrow. (ADJ-grat)I'd really appreciate it.
-- (HA)Can I borrow some money to pay for my lunch? (ADJ)I've forgotten my money. (ADJ-grat)I'd really appreciate it.
-- (HA)Could I please borrow some money for lunch? (ADJ-ret)I'll pay you when I get home.
-- (Wouldn't ask) (4x)

Once again, we find several instances where the English NSs differentiated expressions between close friends and acquaintances, contrary to Fukushima's assertion quoted above. Also, there are again a few NS expressions which were deemed inappropriate by Fukushima when they were used by NNSs. In fact, the demand "Let me borrow your CD" was the most often used expression when requesting to borrow a CD from a close friend.

It is noteworthy that no instances of positive politeness strategies were used by the English NSs; only negative

politeness strategies were employed. In other words, there were no overt attempts to build camaraderie with the addressee, although casual lead-ins such as "Guess what" and "Shoot" might be considered as covert attempts. Furthermore, directives delivered in a high pitch with rising tone in offering situations such as "Sit down" (as opposed to the command "Sit down!", falling tone) could be covert attempts at camaraderie-building. No English NS offers included overt camaraderie-building devices either, but as can be seen in Table 11, Japanese EFL learners attempted to translate these strategies into English from Japanese, producing offers (and requests) sounding odd to NS ears.

English NSs nearly always acknowledged the addressee's freedom of action by offering the option to comply with the request or not. Words and phrases which represent this negative politeness strategy include "if you don't mind," "could you," would you mind," "would it be possible," and "is there any way."

5.1 Analysis of Japanese offers

In Japanese, many social factors are taken into account in determining what style of speech will be used. A Japanese speaker must decide whether or not to use honorifics, formal verb endings and/or gerunds, in-group jargon, and also must decide what particles to use in any interaction. The factors governing these choices are social position, age difference, sex difference, and aoutgroupness (Martin, 1964 as cited in Loveday, 1986, p. 5). By using the present survey (designed by Fukushima, 1990), an attempt was made by Fukushima to

neutralize the variables of social position and age and to focus on the idea of how Japanese offers and requests are expressed based solely on outgroupness, or interpersonal distance between the two interactants. (The variable of gender was not considered. As such, some distinct "women's words" and "men's words" surfaced in several responses and will be noted as they arise.)

In the survey then, the main concern for the addressee is using language which is appropriate for the degree of closeness between the interactants. Close friends are addressed in Japanese in such a way so as not to seem distant from them. In Fukushima's appendix (1990), one subject is quoted as saying, "...it would sound distant if we use formal expressions to our close friends" (p. 325). In order to avoid sounding distant, Japanese NSs include very few polite or formal words or verb endings when the degree of closeness increases. Similarly, but contrary to Fukushima's claims about English, modal verb constructions are not often used in English as the degree of closeness increases. Conversely, English conditional modal constructions *increase* in occurance as the degree of closeness *decreases*. And although their presence alone does not necessarily work to keep the addresser aloof from the addressee, they do serve to raise the level of formality. In this way, Japanese and English requests and offers appear to be pragmatically similar.

The main differnce between the two languages is that Japanese offers and requests contain more positive politeness strategies (as discussed above), i.e. particles and verb forms

used to overtly create a sense of solidarity or camaraderie between the interactants. Also, Japanese requests are likely to be open-ended, using "kedo" or "ga" (but) at the ends of requests (cf. McGloin, 1983, p. 129). The effect of this is similar to an off record hint and will be discussed in greater detail below. Table 5 gives representative Japanese offers.

***TABLE 5***

**REPRESENTATIVE JAPANESE OFFERS ELICITED FROM NATIVE JAPANESE SPEAKERS**
(n=10, ages 18-25)

Situation #1: Offering a seat
(Very close to addressee)

-- (HA) suwa tta ra?
*sit informal inf. question (Q)*
*(inf.)*
*past indicative*

-- (HA) suware ba?
*sit-inf. how about (rising tone)*
*imperative*
*(imp.)*

-- (HA) suwa tte (2x)
*sit inf. gerund*

-- (HA) suware yo! (2x)
*sit-inf. inf. intensifier*
*imp.*

(Gets along with addressee)

-- (HA) osuwareinara doo desu ka?
*sit-formal how about Q*
*imperative*

-- (HA) suwa tte (2x)
*sit inf. gerund*

-- (HA) suware yo!
*sit-inf. inf. intensifier*
*imp.*

-- (ADJ) koko ni (HA) suware ba?
here locative sit-inf. how about
particle
(LOC)

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (HA) suware ba.
*sit-inf. imperative (imp.)* *how about (falling tone)*

-- (ADJ) koko ga aitemasu kedo...
*here* *nominative particle (NOM)* *open-formal indicative* *but*

-- (HA) kochira ni suwa tte kudasai
*this place* *LOC* *sit* *inf. gerund* *please*

-- (HA) suwa tte
*sit* *inf. gerund*

<u>Situation #2: Offering a beer</u>
(Very close to addressee)

-- (HA) biiru (demo) doo (3x)
*beer* *how about*

-- (HA) nomu?
*drink-inf. indicative (rising tone)*

-- (HA) nomu yo! (2x)
*drink-inf. indicative* *cameraderie-builder (=Let's drink!)*

-- (HA) nome!
*drink-inf. imperative*

(Gets along with addressee)

-- (ADJ) biiru aru kedo
*beer* *have-inf. indicative* *but...*

-- (HA) biiru nomu? (2x)
*beer* *drink-inf. indicative (rising tone)*

-- (HA) biiru (demo) doo (2x)
*beer* *how about*

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (HA) biiru nomitai (no)? (2x)
*beer* *want to drink* *inf. Q*

-- (ADJ) biiru aru (HA) kedo nomu?
*beer* *have-inf. indicative* *but (deference)* *drink-inf. indicative*

-- (HA) biiru wa ikaga desu ka?
*beer topic how about- copula Q*
*particle formal*
*(TOP)*

-- (HA) biiru nomimasu ka?
*beer drink-formal Q*
*indicative*

Situation #3: Offering a cup of coffee
(Very close to addressee)

-- (HA) kohii nomu (ka)? (4x)
*coffee drink-inf. Q*
*indicative*

-- (LI) ne (HA) kohii nomanai?
*um, coffee drink don't you?*
*(inf. deferential ending)*

(Gets along with addressee)

-- (HA) kohii iru? (2x)
*coffee want-inf. indicative*

-- (HA) kohii nomu? (2x)
*coffee drink-inf. indicative*

-- (HA) kohii demo nomaremasu ka?
*coffee (how) drink-formal Q*
*about indicative potential*

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (ADJ) kohii tsuke tta (HA) kedo nomu?
*coffee make past-inf. but drink-inf.*
*indicative indicative*

-- (HA) nomitai?
*want to drink (coffee)?*

-- (HA) kohii nomimasu? (3x)
*coffee drink-formal indicative*

-- (ADJ) kohii desu (HA) kedo nomu?
*coffee copula but drink-inf. indicative*

First, let us analyze the responses in the first situation. R. Lakoff (as cited in McGloin, 1983, p. 127) lists three principle politeness functions of language use.

These are: 1) Formality: keep aloof; 2) Deference: give options; and 3) Camaraderie: show sympathy. According to McGloin, the first two represent negative politeness strategies, seeking to reassure the addressee that his/her freedom of action will not be infringed upon. The third is a positive politeness strategy in that it's purpose is to treat the addressee as a member of an ingroup (p. 130).

We have seen that English NSs used no overt positive politeness strategies. However there were numerous examples of negative politeness strategies (Lakoff's "Deference"). In Japanese addressees are given options as in English, but are also addressed with expressions meant to build or reaffirm camaraderie between the interactants. For example, the particle "ba" (how about?) is both informal, fostering camaraderie, as well as open-ended, leaving the final decision to the addressee. Likewise "kedo" (but) leaves the offer wide open, roughly equivalent to, "Here's a seat for you, but...(you don't have to take it if you don't want to") (McGloin, 1983, p. 129). The end particle "yo" is an informal intensifier also used as a camaraderie-builder. Another deferential particle is "ne" functioning approximately the same as a variety of English tag questions such as "...don't you think?" or "...isn't it?"

The most obvious and thoroughly studied markers of formality in Japanese are formal and honorific verb forms. Such forms are used when the addresser wishes to show respect for the addressee, the referent of a conversation, or non-interactants who may be listening to the speaker. Whether or

not these verb forms are used depends again on the ages, social status, gender and degree of closeness of the interactants. An example of the honorific system from Hori (1987, p. 4) is "iku" (go, informal indicative)compared to "ikimasu" (go, formal indicative) and "irassayu" (go, honorific indicative). Thus a question with the honorific (past tense) such as "Kinou eiga ni irasshaimashita ka?" could only be translated roughly as "Could I ask if you went to the movies yesterday?" or "I was wondering if you happened to go to the movies yesterday?" Nothing even close to this level of formality was used by the Japanese subjects on the survey because the age and social status of the interactants were equal. Yet NS English subjects did use expressions such as this, especially in requests for money. This is again indicative of the case of modal verb constructions in English; they work to raise the level of formality, while not necessarily suggesting that the addresser wants to remain aloof. In Japanese though, being formal means remaining aloof, and for this reason Fukushima's subjects felt odd about using constructions in English which they felt would distance themselves and their social equals.

Only the contrast between informal indicative verb endings (-ru/-re) and formal indicative verb endings (-masu) were used on the present surveys. The formal versions were used by some, but by no means all, subjects as a way of expressing aloofness from addressees with whom they did not get along. However some respondents did not change verb forms at all between situations, with one subject even saying that

he would use the same offers and requests in each situation at all three degrees of closeness. Most Japanese NSs did however make some minor distinctions between expressions said to close friends versus others, if only by using a rising tone for close friends and a falling tone for others. The fact that the Japanese respondents here varied their responses only slightly between the degrees of closeness suggests that Fukushima's EFL learners' "rude" responses were transferred from Japanese due to a lack of sufficient English pragmatic training.

Finally, we return to the directive "Sit down" and the blunt inquiry "Do you want a beer?" These both appear in the NS English surveys, on the Japanese surveys, and on the Japanese EFL learners' English surveys of both Fukushima and this study. Here however, they are deemed acceptible; provided the expressions are said with the correct intonation, L1 transfer has provided the Japanese EFL learners with perfectly natural English offers. In both languages, close friends are made offers more directly than are other addressees. And at the same time, there is a tendancy in both languages to make direct, cold-sounding offers to people with whom the addresser does not get along.

5.2 Analysis of Japanese requests

An in-depth analysis of Japanese requests is not necessary, as they are consistent with the findings of the contrastive analysis of offers. In both languages the addresser often leaves the addressee the option of declining the request (deference), and this more often as the degree of

closeness decreases. Likewise, promises of return are used in Japanese more often as the degree of closeness decreases, as is the case in English. In requests, as in offers, Japanese use positive politeness strategies slightly more than English speakers, who do not use overt camaraderie-builders at all. Table 6 gives representative examples of Japanese requests.

***TABLE 6***

**REPRESENTATIVE JAPANESE REQUESTS ELICITED FROM NATIVE JAPANESE SPEAKERS**
(n=10, ages 18-25)

Situation #1: Asking for repayment of a loan
(Very close to addressee)

-- (HA) Y5,000 hayaku kaeshite (3x)
*5,000 yen soon return-inf. gerund*

-- (LI) sorosoro (HA) Y5,000 kaeshite kureru
*marker of indirectness used to soften the coming request* *5,000 yen* *return-inf. gerund* *give-inf. indicative*

(Gets along with addressee)

-- (LI) sorosoro Y5,000 kaeshite moreru
*(same as above)* *5,000 yen* *return-inf. gerund* *receive-inf. affirmative indicative-potential*

kana
*deference marker*

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (HA) ima Y5,000 kaeshite hooshii n
*now* *5,000 yen* *return-inf. gerund* *want* *inf./familiar form*

dakedo...
*but (deference)*

**Situation #2: Asking to borrow a CD**
(Very close to addressee)

-- (LI) nee, ano/kono Madonna (no) CD kashite
*um, that/this genitive particle (GEN) loan-inf. gerund*

yo (2x)
*'women's word' cameraderie-building intensifier*

(Gets along with addressee)

-- (HA) kono Madonna CD kashite kiraeru kana
*this loan-inf. gerund receive-inf. affirmative indicative potential deference marker*

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (ADJ) moshi yokatta ra (HA) kono Madonna CD kashite
*(=If it's O.K.) this loan-inf. gerund*

moraeru
*receive-inf. affirmative*

**Situation #3: Asking someone to pay for lunch**
(Very close to addressee)

-- (ADJ) kane wasureta (HA) kyoo omae no
*money forget-inf. past indicative today you (men's slang) GEN*

ogori na!
*treat intensifier-comaraderie-building*

-- (HA) kore harau toite!
*this pay-inf. indicative please-inf.*

(Gets along with addressee)

-- (ADJ) gomen o saifu uchi ni oita
*sorry honorific noun prefix wallet house LOC leave-inf. past indicative*

kichiyatta (ADJ-ret) nore atode kaesu kara
*come-past inf. indicative* *soon* *return-inf. indicative* *so*

(HA) chiyatto kashite kurerareru?
*little* *loan-inf. gerund* *give-inf. indicative potential (showing deference)*

-- (ADJ) o saifu wasurechiyatta (HA) o
*honorific noun prefix* *wallet* *forget-past inf. indicative* *honorific noun prefix*

kane kashite moraeru kateyo
*money* *loan-inf. gerund* *receive-inf. infinitive potential* *(softener showing deference)*

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (ADJ) kane wasureta. (HA) ore no bun hara
*money* *forget-inf. past indicative* *I-inf. GEN* *portion*

haratte kurerareru ka? (ADJ-ret) ashita
*pay-inf. gerund* *give-inf. indicative potential* *Q* *tomorrow*

kaesu yo!
*return-inf. indicative* *intensifier and camaraderie-builder*

-- (ADJ) saifu to uchi ni wasurechiyatta
*wallet* *TOP* *house* *LOC* *forget-inf. past indicative*

mitainda kedo. chiyotto o kane kashite
*it seems* *but (deference)* *little* *honorific noun pref.* *money* *loan-inf. gerund*

moraeru kana. (ADJ-ret) ashita sugu kaesu
*receive-inf. indicative potential* *(deference marker)* *tomorrow* *soon* *return-inf. indicative*

ne
*O.K./You know-*
*(deference marker (cf. McGloin 1983:137; Tsuda 1984:40)*

## 6.0 Japanese EFL learners' offers and requests

Tables 7, 8, 9, and 10 point out some diffrences in judgements of acceptability between Fukushima's (1990) study and the present one. Although there is not a large number of responses acceptable in according to this study and not the 1990 one, several of those which are acceptable by the standards set forth here are ones which we see occurring with relatively high frequency on English NS surveys. Moreover, these responses suggest that English sentential intonation and pitch be taught along with pragmatics and that pragmatics be presented with as much emphasis as grammar. Tables 11 and 12 list dozens of offers and requests which are grammatically well-formed, but which are pragmatically disasterous.

***TABLE 7***

**ENGLISH OFFERS BY JAPANESE EFL STUDENTS (N=22): APPROPRIATE ACCORDING TO FUKUSHIMA (1990)**

Situation #1: offering a seat
(very close to addressee)

-- (HA)Have a seat.

(gets along with addressee)

-- (HA)Have a seat.

(does not get along with addressee)

-- (HA)Have a seat.
-- (HA)Would you like to sit down.

Situation #2: offering a beer
(very close to addressee)

-- (ADJ)Do you drink beer?
-- (HA)How about a beer?
-- (HA)Do you want a glass of/to drink beer? (2x)
-- (ADJ)Do you like beer?
-- (HA)Do you want a beer?

(gets along with addressee)

-- (HA)How about a beer? (3x)
-- (HA)Have a beer, won't you?

-- (HA)Do you want a glass of beer?
-- (ADJ)Do you like beer?

(does not get along with addressee)

-- (HA)Would you like to drink a beer?
-- (HA)Would you want to drink a beer?

Situation #3: offering a cup of coffee
(very close to addressee)

-- (HA)Do you want to drink a cup of coffee?
-- (HA)Here you go.
-- (ADJ)Do you drink coffee?
-- (HA)Do you want a cup of coffee?
-- (HA)How about a cup of coffee?
-- (HA)Coffee O.K.?
-- (ADJ)You drink coffee, don't you?

(gets along with addressee)

-- (HA)How about (a cup of) coffee? (4x)
-- (HA)May I offer you a cup of coffee?
-- (HA)Do you drink coffee?
-- (HA)Will you have a cup of coffee?
-- (HA)Have a coffee, won't you?
-- (HA)Here you go.
-- (HA)Would you like coffee?

(does not get along with addressee)

-- (HA)Would you like (to drink) coffee? (2x)
-- (HA)Here you go.
-- (HA)What about a cup of coffee?

***TABLE 8***

**ENGLISH OFFERS BY JAPANESE EFL STUDENTS (N=22): APPROPRIATE ACCORDING TO THE PRESENT STUDY, ASSUMING INTONATION AND PITCH ARE APPROPRIATE (RESPONSES FROM TABLE 8 ARE ALSO ACCEPTABLE)**

Situation #1: offering a seat
(very close to addressee)

-- (HA)Sit down. (2x)
-- (LI)Oh, hello. (HA)Sit down (ADJ)wherever you want.

(gets along with addressee)

-- (LI)Oh, hello. (HA)Sit down (ADJ)wherever you want.

(does not get along with addressee)

-- (LI)Hello. (ADJ)There are some chairs.

Situation #2: offering a beer
(very close to addressee)

-- (HA)Drink a beer! (3x)

(does not get along with addressee)

-- (ADJ)There's (some cups of/a) beer. (2x)

***TABLE 9***
**ENGLISH REQUESTS BY JAPANESE EFL STUDENTS (N=22): APPROPRIATE ACCORDING TO FUKUSHIMA (1990)**

Situation #1: Asking for repayment of a loan
(very close to addressee)

-- (LI)Hey, (ADJ)I loaned you some money, didn't I?

(gets along with addressee)

-- (HA)Could you pay me back the (that) $30.00?
-- (HA)Can you pay me back the (that) $30.00?
-- (ADJ)If you have enough money, (HA)can you pay it back now?
-- (HA)Could you return the $30.00 that I loaned you?
-- (HA)Can you pay me back?

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (HA)Could you pay me back (the/that $30.00)? (3x)

Situation #2: Asking to borrow a CD
(very close to addressee)

-- (HA)May I borrow your Madonna CD? (2x)
-- (HA)Can you loan me your Madonna CD?

(gets along with addressee)

-- (HA)May I borrow your Madonna CD? (3x)
-- (HA)Can/Could you loan me your Madonna CD? (4x)
-- (HA)Could I borrow your Madonna CD (ADJ-ret)for two days?

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (HA)Could you lend/loan me your (Madonna) CD? (5x)
-- (HA)May I borrow your Madonna CD?

Situation #3: Asking someone to pay for lunch
(very close to addressee)

-- (ADJ)I forgot my money. (HA)Could you loan me some money?
-- (HA)Could you loan me some money to pay for my lunch?
-- (LI)I'm sorry. (ADJ)I forgot my money at home. (HA)Can you loan me some money?

(gets along with addressee)

-- (LI)I'm sorry. (ADJ)I forgot my money at home. (HA)Can you loan me some money?
-- (ADJ)I forgot my money. (HA)Could you loan me some money?
-- (LI)I'm sorry, (ADJ)I forgot my wallet. (HA)Could you loan me some money to pay for my lunch?
-- (ADJ)I have no money. (HA)Can you pay for me?
-- (HA)Could I borrow some money (ADJ)because I forgot mine at home?

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (LI)I'm sorry. (ADJ)I forgot my money at home. (HA)Could you loan me some money? (ADJ-ret)I will pay it back tomorrow.

***TABLE 10***

**ENGLISH REQUESTS BY JAPANESE EFL STUDENTS (N=22): APPROPRIATE ACCORDING TO THE PRESENT STUDY, ASSUMING INTONATION AND PITCH ARE APPROPRIATE (RESPONSES FROM TABLE 11 ARE ALSO ACCEPTABLE)**

Situation #1: Asking for repayment of a loan
(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (HA)Please pay me back as quickly as you can.
-- (LI)Ah, please pay back my money.
-- Could you please pay back my $30.00?

Situation #2: Asking to borrow a CD
(very close to addressee)

-- (ADJ)I want to borrow your Madonna CD.
-- (HA)Lend me you Madonna CD, (ADJ)if you have it.

(gets along with addressee)

-- (HA)Could you please loan me your Madonna CD?
-- (ADJ)I would like to borrow your Madonna CD.

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (HA)Could you please lend me your Madonna CD?

Situation #3: Asking someone to pay for lunch
(very close to addressee)

-- (ADJ)I forgot my money/wallet. (2x)

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- (HA)Could you please loan me some money (ADJ)because I forgot mine at home? (ADJ-ret)I'll pay you back tomorrow.
-- (HA)Could you please loan me some money today for lunch?

***TABLE 11***

**ENGLISH OFFERS BY JAPANESE EFL STUDENTS (N=22): INAPPROPRIATE ACCORDING TO THE PRESENT STUDY, REQUIRING PRAGMATIC AND/OR INTONATION AND PITCH INSTRUCTION.**

Situation #1: offering a seat
(very close to addressee)

-- (Please) sit down (please). (6)
-- Could you please sit down?
-- Please be seated. (2)
-- Please have a seat. (2)
-- Let's sit down the seat!
-- You can sit.

(gets along with addressee)

-- (Please) sit down (please). (7x)
-- Please have a seat (2x)
-- Could you sit your/this seat? (3x)
-- Let's sit down the seat!
-- Please have a seat if you wish.

(does not get along with addressee)

-- Please sit down. (3x)
-- Please sit this seat. (3x)
-- Please (gesturing toward the seat).
-- Sit.

Situation #2: offering a beer
(very close to addressee)

-- Hey, you can drink more.
-- (Please) Drink (a glass of) beer. (5x)
-- Let's drink.
-- Please have a beer.
-- Please drink.
-- Will you drink more?
-- Could you please drink a cup of beer?
-- Hey, drink a beer!

(gets along with addressee)

-- May I offer you to drink beer?
-- Will you drink a beer? (2x)
-- You shall drink a beer more.
-- Please drink a beer. (3x)
-- Let's drink a beer. (2x)
-- Could you drink a beer? (2x)

(does not get along with addressee)

-- Could you drink a (glass of) beer? (2x)
-- Please drink a (glass of) beer. (3x)
-- Will/Would you drink a beer? (3x)
-- You shall drink a beer of your own accord.
-- Please. (gesturing towards the beer)
-- Do you drink a beer? (2x)

Situation #3: offering a cup of coffee

Very similar to Situation #2.

***TABLE 12***

**ENGLISH REQUESTS BY JAPANESE EFL STUDENTS (N=22): INAPPROPRIATE ACCORDING TO THE PRESENT STUDY, REQUIRING PRAGMATIC AND/OR INTONATION AND PITCH INSTRUCTION.**

Situation #1: Asking for repayment of a loan
(very close to addressee)

-- Pay money back to me, quickly.
-- Pay me money back.
-- Please pay me back $30.00.
-- Pay me back the money I lent you right now!
-- Please pay me back. (2x)
-- Return $30.00.

(gets along with addressee)

-- Could you please pay me back (quickly) (2x)?
-- Please pay me money back..

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- Please return $30.00.
-- Pay back $30.00.
-- Pay!

Situation #2: Asking to borrow a CD
(very close to addressee)

-- Please loan me your Madonna CD. (4x)

(gets along with addressee)

-- Please loan me your Madonna CD. (2x)
-- Please loan Madonna CD.

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- Lend your Madonna CD.
-- Please loan your CD, if you are O.K.
-- I want to listen to this CD. Please loan your CD.

Situation #3: Asking someone to pay for lunch
(very close to addressee)

-- I forgot my money at home, please lend me your money?
-- May I borrow your money because I forgot my money at home. I must go back your money tomorrow.
-- I'm sorry I forgot money. Please pay all money.
-- Can you pay money for my lunch substitute for my having no money?
-- Please loan/lend me (your/some) money. (4x)
-- Do you loan (me)any/some money? (2x)
-- Pay for money of my lunch price.
-- Please pay for my lunch.
-- I forgot my money, so please loan some money.
-- Sorry, I forgot my money at home. Will you pay together because I will pay later. *(grammar only--pragmatics OK)*
-- Please loan me some money because I forgot my money at home.

(gets along with addressee)

-- Please loan me some money because I forgot my money at home.
-- Do you lend your money?
-- Please loan me some money to pay for my lunch.
-- I forgot my money, so may I borrow some money?
-- Can you pay for my lunch?
-- I'm sorry, I forgot my money. Pay for money of my lunch price.
-- Could you loan me some money to pay for my lunch? *(needs ADJ)*
-- Can you lend me (some) money? (2x)
-- Please loan (me) some/your money. (2x)
-- I'm sorry I forgot money. Could you please pay all money?
-- I forgot my money at home, so I would like to borrow your money.

(Does not get along with addressee)

-- I was wondering if you could lend me your money. *(needs ADJ)*
-- Can I borrow your money?
-- I'm sorry I forgot money. If you are O.K., could you please pay all money?
-- I forgot my money. Pay it substitute for me.
-- Excuse me, but may I borrow your money?
-- Could you loan/lend (me) any/some money? (5x)
-- I forgot my money. Could you please loan me any money?
-- May you pay for my lunch?
-- Please lend your money for my lunch.

## 7.0 Conclusions

Through a detailed contrastive analysis of English and

Japanese offers and requests, the present study has attempeted to point out weaknesses in an earlier, non-contrastive study of Japanese EFL learners' English production. Several of the findings of the present study appear to contradict various points in the previous one (contradictory points are asterisked). These major findings are as follows:

1. Due at least in part to a lack of pragmatic training, Japanese EFL/ESL students tend to rely heavily on Japanese pragmatic strategies (L1 pragmatic transfer).
2. This L1 transfer, however, often results in offers and requests which are many times rather close to the offers and requests of native English speakers elicited in this study (i.e. positive transfer).*
3. Japanese uses more overt camaraderie-building devices than English, which may sound odd or unnatural to English NSs if transferred into L2 usage. However, sentential intonation and pitch may in fact be a form of covert camaraderie-builder in English, especially in offers to close friends and acquaintances.
4. Both English and Japanese speakers of the age surveyed differentiate expressions between close friends and acquaintances (although one Japanese claimed that this is not done in Japanese and Fukushima (1990) claims it is not done in English).*
5. Native English speakers in the age group surveyed often use directives or direct questions when offering or making bald-on-record requests of close friends.*
6. Native English speakers of the age group surveyed often

feel that "please," said with the correct intonation, makes requests more polite in certain situations (eg. the "plaintive please" used in money-borrowing situations).*

**7.** English uses modal auxiliaries as the most common way of showing deference to the addressee's positive face (free will), while Japanese employs a number of open-ended questions, potential verb forms which show deference to the addressee, and individual lexical items implying deference.

**8.** Japanese use formal verb endings to remain aloof from some addressees, especially when offering. The conditional modals used in English do not necessarily have this function, although their occurance *does* increase as the degree of closeness decreases and *does* raise the level of formality.*

**9.** In situations where the Japanese and English pragmatics are similar, EFL/ESL learners should be encouraged to explore Japanese strategies and to apply these to English. In such cases, special attention should be given to sentential intonation, stress and pitch practice to make very natural offers such as "Sit down!" sound friendly to close friends and acquaintances.*

**10.** Japanese EFL learners were not able to produce appropriate adjuncts (ADJ of gratitude, promise of return, excuse, etc.) in either offers or requests. These need to be introduced in the classroom along with the offer/request forms, especially in cases of large requests.

## NOTES

1. This paper is a revised and expanded version of a paper presented at the 28th Annual TESOL Conference, Baltimore, MD, 1994. The author wishes to thank the audience of that presentation for their questions and comments which aided in clarifying certain points throughout the paper. Thanks is also extended to Elizabeth Riddle and Charles Moore, whose suggestions and criticism have helped strengthen the paper. Any errors contained herein are solely the responsibility of the author.

2. It has been pointed out that although the questionnaire devised by Fukushima and also used in this study has limited the variables, it may indeed be an attempt to scale something which is not scalable. The three categories, "very close to the addressee, gets along with the addressee, does not get along with the addressee" are not in fact symmetrical. In other words, "getting along" with someone might not correspond to how close, or how well you know that person. Two people can be very close (i.e. siblings) and still not get along. Anyone wishing to utilize this questionnaire in future research might be advised to change the first category to, "gets along very well with the addressee."

## REFERENCES


Alexander, L. G. 1988. *Longman English Grammar*. London: Longman.

Blum-Kulka, S. and E. Olshtain. 1984. Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 5:3, 196-213.

Brown, H. D. 1987. *Principles of language learning and teaching*, 2nd ed. Englewood CLiffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Brown, P. and S. C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Fukushima, S. 1990. Offers and requests: Performance by Japanese learners of English. *World Englishes*. Vol. 9:3, 317-25.

Holtgraves, T. and J. Yang. 1990. Politeness as universal: Cross-cultural perceptions of request strategies and inferences based on their use. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Vol. 59:4, 719-29.

Hori, M. 1987. "Language forms reflecting social hierarchy and psychological attitude." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Conference of Applied Linguistics, Sydney, Australia, August 16-21, 1987.

Kitao, S. K. and K. Kitao. 1991. *Communicating with Americans: Functions in English. Tokyo*: Eichosha Co., Ltd.

Lange, R. A. 1988. *501 Japanese Verbs*. New York: Barron's Press.

Leech, G. N. 1987. *Meaning and the English Verb*, 2nd ed. London: Longman.

Levinson, S. C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Loveday, L. 1986. *Explorations in Japanese Sociolinguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

McGloin, N. H. 1983. Some politeness strategies in Japanese. In Miyagawa, S. (Ed.), *Papers in Linguistics: Studies in Japanese Language Use and studies in the Languages of the USSR*. Vol. 16, 127-45.

Searle, J. R. 1976. The classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*. Vol. 5, 1-24.

Tsuda, A. 1984. Sales *Talk in Japan and the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Wenger, J. Variation and change in Japanese honorific forms. In Miyagawa, S. (Ed.), *Papers in Linguistics: Studies in Japanese Language Use and studies in the Languages of the USSR*. Vol. 16, 267-300.

APPENDIX: *The following are the instructions and situational prompts given to both English and Japanese subjects. Although the Japanese subjects were asked to respond in Japanese, the prompts were in English (the instructions were in Japanese). This appears not to have affected the Japanese responses. The only difference in the situational prompts for the two language groups was that $30.00 (request situation #1) was changed into 3,000 yen on the Japanese survey. This was done so that the Japanese would be able to assess the monetary significance or "size" of the request. Space was left for the subjects to write their responses. The degrees of closeness are the same in all situations.*

Pragmatic Survey of Japanese and English Offers and Requests

Instructions: Below you will find several social situations in which the speech acts of offering and requesting are involved. For each situation, please keep the following in mind:

1) You are the addresser. In other words, you are doing the offering and requesting.

2) The person to whom you are talking, the addressee, is of about <u>equal social status and age</u> as yourself.

3) In each given situation, imagine that you are speaking with a different person on three different occasions. The degree of closeness between you and each person, i.e. how well you know the person, is variable. These degrees of closeness are as follows:

a) You are very close to the addressee (for example a close friend, or brother or sister).

b) You get along with the addressee; you are acquaintances on good terms with one another.

c) You <u>do not</u> get along with the addressee; you <u>do not</u> like one another.

Instructions: p.2-p.5には、あることを勧めたり、お願いしたりする時のいくつかの状況を設定した英文があります.
次の事がらを頭において英文を読んでください.

1) あなたは依頼人です. つまり、あなたがあることを勧めたり、お願いしたりしています.
2) あなたが話している相手、つまり応答する人は、あなたと社会的地位も年齢もほぼ同じです.
3) それぞれの状況の中で、あなたは異なった場面で異なった人に話しかけていると考えてください.
あなたと応答する人の親しさ、たとえばあなたがどの位その人を知っているかは次の様に変化します.

a)あなたは、応答する人ととても親しい仲（たとえば、親友や兄弟姉妹）
b)あなたは、応答する人とうまくやっていける程度の仲の良い知り合い.
c)あなたは、応答する人とうまくやっていけないし、お互いに好きでない間柄.

## OFFERING

In the three situations below, you are offering someone something. Please write what you would say in each situation and write it exactly as if you were speaking. If you would not make an offer in the given situation, please explain why not.

(1) You offer someone a seat at a party at your home.

Degrees of closeness:
a) You are very close to the addressee.
b) You get along with the addressee.
c) You do not get along with the addressee.

(2) You offer someone a beer at a party at your home.

Degrees of closeness: Same

(3) You offer someone coffee during the coffee break at work.

Degrees of closeness: Same

## REQUESTING

Please follow the same procedure as you did for OFFERING. Again, if you simply would not make the request in the given situation, please explain why not. The situations are as follows:

(1) You loaned someone $30.00 a few weeks ago, and now you want him/her to pay you back.

Degrees of closeness: Same

(2) You ask someone to loan you his/her Madonna CD.

Degrees of closeness: Same

(3) When having lunch with someone at a restaurant, you realize that you forgot your money at home, so you ask the other person to loan you some money to pay for your lunch.

Degrees of closeness: Same